DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 877 JC 020 505

AUTHOR	Shields, Jennifer A.; Self, Charlotte C.
TITLE	Information Services Faculty/Staff Survey Results. Research Report.
INSTITUTION	Piedmont Virginia Community Coll., Charlottesville, VA. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
REPORT NO	PVCC-RR-2-2002
PUB DATE	2002-05-00
NOTE	60p.; Appended questionnaire contains cropped text.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.pvcc.cc.va.us/ir/Studies/IT%20Survey%20Report%20(2002).pdf.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Computers; *Educational Technology; *Employee Attitudes; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Services; Teacher Attitudes; Technology; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Piedmont Virginia Community College

ABSTRACT

During the fall term of 2001, Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) (Virginia) distributed a survey to faculty and staff regarding the information technology facilities and services at the college. A total of 62 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 18.6%. This report details the survey results. Highlights include: (1) overall, respondents were satisfied with computer applications, technical support, electronic classrooms, distance learning, and training and workshops offered at the college; (2) satisfaction was highest for the computer hardware and software, faculty and staff e-mail services, availability of technical support, and promptness of response and knowledge of technical staff; (3) satisfaction was lowest for student e-mail services and PVCC's Internet pages; (4) 79% of respondents stated that they used the PVCC Internet; (5) 71% said they were not familiar with service level agreements; (6) 86% used the Help Desk for technical support; (7) 61% used the Teaching Center; (8) 50% attended a workshop or training session; and (9) 47% found the workshop they attended to be informative. Specific recommendations were to review the service level agreements, study technical support for adjunct faculty (only 5% of whom responded to the survey), and revise as appropriate the College's Internet and Intranet sites. Contains numerous tables detailing survey responses. Survey instrument and responses to open-ended questions are appended. (EMH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 877

Information Services Faculty/Staff Survey Results

Research Report No. 2-2002

May 2002

Piedmont Virginia Community College
Charlottesville, Virginia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Head
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Jennifer A. Shields
Institutional Research Associate

Charlotte C. Self
Chair, Technical Support Task Force

SO 502 012

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Information Services Faculty/Staff Survey Results

By
Jennifer A. Shields
Institutional Research Associate

and

Charlotte C. Self
Chair, Technical Support Task Force

Office of Institutional Research
Piedmont Virginia Community College
501 College Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22902-7589

Research Report No. 2-2002
May 2002

Table of Contents

Methodology 1

Results 2

Electronic Classrooms/Distance Learning 18

Information Technology Services Overall. 27

Findings 28

Computer Applications 28

Technical Support 30

Electronic Classrooms/Distance Learning 32

Training and Workshops 34

Information Technology Services Overall. 34

Discussion 35

Appendix A: Responses to Open-Ended Questions 39

Appendix B: Survey Instrument 55

Methodology

During the fall of 2001, the Office of Institutional Research collaborated with the Technical Support Task Force to survey the Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) faculty and staff regarding the information technology facilities and services at PVCC. The survey was developed to address several key areas of interest to the task force, including computer applications, technical support, electronic classrooms and distance learning, and training and workshops offered through instructional technology. The survey was developed, reviewed and approved by both the Technical Support Task Force and the Office of Institutional Research.

The survey was distributed via internal mail to every PVCC faculty and staff member. Each instrument was color coded by respondent type (classified staff, full-time faculty, part-time faculty and administration). Follow-up e-mails were sent to all potential respondents, and a second survey was distributed two weeks after the initial distribution.

Sixty-two surveys were returned, for a total response rate of 18.6%. The small number of part-time staff who completed the survey lowers this response rate considerably; this group had a response rate of 5%. The rest of the groups had much higher response rates (full-time faculty, 45%; classified staff, 33.3%; and administration, 28%). This discrepancy in response rates was expected, given the amount of time part-time faculty spend on campus, and the limited interactions many have with IT facilities and services. The responses to open-ended questions are provided in Appendix A and the survey instrument is included in Appendix B.

Results

Results from this survey are presented in the following report. The following frequency tables show the responses to each of the questions on the survey, broken down by respondent type, as well as collapsed across all respondent types. The tables include the number of respondents giving each answer (Frequency), the percent of total respondents giving each answer (Total %), and the percent of people responding to that particular question giving each answer (Valid %).

Computer Applications

Computer for general use

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	9	40.9	40.9	40.9
	Good	11	50.0	50.0	90.9
	Fair	2	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	6	26.1	26.1	26.1
	Good	14	60.9	60.9	87.0
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	5	50.0	50.0	70.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	80.0
	No Response	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	6	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Computer for general use (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	23	37.1	37.1	37.1
Good	31	50.0	50.0	87.1
Fair	5	8.1	8.1	95.2
No Response	3	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Software for general use

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	10	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Good	12	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	Good	13	56.5	56.5	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	50.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	60.0
	No Response	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	6	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Software for general use (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	27	43.5	43.5	43.5
Good	29	46.8	46.8	90.3
Fair	1	1.6	1.6	91.9
No Response	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Additional Hardware for general use

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	9	40.9	40.9	40.9
	Good	10	45.5	45.5	86.4
	Fair	1	4.5	4.5	90.9
	Poor	1	4.5	4.5	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	3	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Good	14	60.9	60.9	73.9
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	82.6
	Poor	2	8.7	8.7	91.3
	No Response	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	3	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	60.0
	Fair	2	20.0	20.0	80.0
	Poor	1	10.0	10.0	90.0
	No Response	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	4	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Good	3	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Additional Hardware for general use (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	19	30.6	30.6	30.6
Good	30	48.4	48.4	79.0
Fair	5	8.1	8.1	87.1
Poor	4	6.5	6.5	93.5
No Response	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

PVCC's Internet pages

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	2	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Good	17	77.3	77.3	86.4
	Fair	2	9.1	9.1	95.5
	Poor	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	6	26.1	26.1	26.1
	Good	11	47.8	47.8	73.9
	Fair	3	13.0	13.0	87.0
	No Response	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	6	60.0	60.0	80.0
	No Response	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	57.1
	Poor	3	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

PVCC's Internet pages (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	11	17.7	17.7	17.7
Good	35	56.5	56.5	74.2
Fair	7	11.3	11.3	85.5
Poor	4	6.5	6.5	91.9
No Response	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Do you use the PVCC Intranet?

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Yes	20	90.9	90.9	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	No	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Yes	17	73.9	73.9	91.3
	No Response	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	No	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Yes	5	50.0	50.0	90.0
	No Response	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Yes	7	100.0	100.0	100.0

Do you use the PVCC Intranet? (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	9	14.5	14.5	14.5
Yes	49	79.0	79.0	93.5
No Response	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Faculty/Staff Email services

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	8	36.4	36.4	36.4
	Good	11	50.0	50.0	86.4
	Fair	2	9.1	9.1	95.5
	Poor	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	14	60.9	60.9	60.9
	Good	6	26.1	26.1	87.0
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	2	20.0	20.0	40.0
	Poor	1	10.0	10.0	50.0
	No Response	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	5	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	85.7
	Fair	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Faculty/Staff Email services (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	29	46.8	46.8	46.8
Good	20	32.3	32.3	79.0
Fair	5	8.1	8.1	87.1
Poor	2	3.2	3.2	90.3
No Response	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Student Email Services

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Good	2	9.1	9.1	13.6
	Fair	5	22.7	22.7	36.4
	Poor	2	9.1	9.1	45.5
	No Response	12	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Good	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	39.1
	Poor	2	8.7	8.7	47.8
	No Response	12	52.2	52.2	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	No Response	10	100.0	100.0	100.0
Administration	Excellent	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Good	2	28.6	28.6	42.9
	Poor	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Student Email Services (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	2	3.2	3.2	3.2
Good	11	17.7	17.7	21.0
Fair	7	11.3	11.3	32.3
Poor	8	12.9	12.9	45.2
No Response	34	54.8	54.8	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Familiar with SLA's

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	18	81.8	81.8	81.8
	Yes	4	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	No	16	69.6	69.6	69.6
	Yes	5	21.7	21.7	91.3
	No Response	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	No	9	90.0	90.0	90.0
	No Response	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	No	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Yes	6	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Familiar with SLA's (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	44	71.0	71.0	71.0
Yes	15	24.2	24.2	95.2
No Response	3	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Technical Support

Do you use help desk for tech support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	2	9.1	9.1	9.1
	Yes	20	90.9	90.9	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Yes	22	95.7	95.7	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	No	3	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Yes	4	40.0	40.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Yes	7	100.0	100.0	100.0

Do you use help desk for tech support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	5	8.1	8.1	8.1
Yes	53	85.5	85.5	93.5
No Response	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Please rate each of the following items based on your experience and overall satisfaction:

Avalability of technical support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	13	59.1	59.1	59.1
	Good	7	31.8	31.8	90.9
	Fair	1	4.5	4.5	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	12	52.2	52.2	52.2
	Good	9	39.1	39.1	91.3
	Fair	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Good	6	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Avalability of technical support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	30	48.4	48.4	48.4
Good	25	40.3	40.3	88.7
Fair	2	3.2	3.2	91.9
No Response	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Technical knowledge of support staff

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	9	40.9	40.9	40.9
	Good	11	50.0	50.0	90.9
	Fair	1	4.5	4.5	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	Good	13	56.5	56.5	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	4	40.0	40.0	60.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Good	3	42.9	42.9	71.4
	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Technical knowledge of support staff (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	22	35.5	35.5	35.5
Good	31	50.0	50.0	85.5
Fair	4	6.5	6.5	91.9
No Response	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Promptness of response

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	13	59.1	59.1	59.1
	Good	6	27.3	27.3	86.4
	Fair	2	9.1	9.1	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	16	69.6	69.6	69.6
	Good	5	21.7	21.7	91.3
	Fair	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	3	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Good	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Promptness of response (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	36	58.1	58.1	58.1
Good	18	29.0	29.0	87.1
Fair	3	4.8	4.8	91.9
No Response	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Ability of support staff to resolve problems

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	8	36.4	36.4	36.4
	Good	11	50.0	50.0	86.4
	Fair	2	9.1	9.1	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	8	34.8	34.8	34.8
	Good	14	60.9	60.9	95.7
	No Response	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	50.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	60.0
	No Response	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	3	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	57.1
	Fair	3	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Ability of support staff to resolve problems (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	21	33.9	33.9	33.9
Good	29	46.8	46.8	80.6
Fair	6	9.7	9.7	90.3
No Response	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Delivery of equipment to classrooms

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Good	5	22.7	22.7	27.3
	Fair	1	4.5	4.5	31.8
	No Response	15	68.2	68.2	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Good	6	26.1	26.1	43.5
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	52.2
	No Response	11	47.8	47.8	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	50.0
	No Response	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	3	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Good	3	42.9	42.9	85.7
	No Response	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Delivery of equipment to classrooms (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	10	16.1	16.1	16.1
Good	17	27.4	27.4	43.5
Fair	3	4.8	4.8	48.4
No Response	32	51.6	51.6	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Overall satisfaction with technical support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	10	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Good	11	50.0	50.0	95.5
	No Response	1	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	10	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Good	11	47.8	47.8	91.3
	No Response	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Good	3	30.0	30.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	3	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Good	2	28.6	28.6	71.4
	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Overall satisfaction with technical support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	27	43.5	43.5	43.5
Good	27	43.5	43.5	87.1
Fair	2	3.2	3.2	90.3
No Response	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

20

Avaliablity of electronic classrooms

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No Response	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	5	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Good	9	39.1	39.1	60.9
	Fair	3	13.0	13.0	73.9
	No Response	6	26.1	26.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Good	1	10.0	10.0	20.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	30.0
	No Response	7	70.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Good	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	No Response	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Avaliablity of electronic classrooms (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	6	9.7	9.7	9.7
Good	12	19.4	19.4	29.0
Fair	4	6.5	6.5	35.5
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	37.1
No Response	39	62.9	62.9	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Electronic Classrooms - performance of equipment

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Good	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	No Response	21	95.5	95.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	3	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Good	11	47.8	47.8	60.9
	Fair	3	13.0	13.0	73.9
	No Response	6	26.1	26.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Good	3	30.0	30.0	30.0
	No Response	7	70.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Good	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	57.1
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	71.4
	No Response	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Electronic Classrooms - performance of equipment (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	3	4.8	4.8	4.8
Good	17	27.4	27.4	32.3
Fair	5	8.1	8.1	40.3
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	41.9
No Response	36	58.1	58.1	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Electronic Classrooms - techincal support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Good	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	No Response	21	95.5	95.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	5	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Good	8	34.8	34.8	56.5
	Fair	2	8.7	8.7	65.2
	No Response	8	34.8	34.8	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Good	1	10.0	10.0	20.0
	No Response	8	80.0	80.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Good	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	57.1
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	71.4
	No Response	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Electronic Classrooms - techincal support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	7	11.3	11.3	11.3
Good	11	17.7	17.7	29.0
Fair	4	6.5	6.5	35.5
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	37.1
No Response	39	62.9	62.9	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Compressed Video Clsasrooms - performance of equipment

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No Response	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Full Time Faculty	Fair	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
	No Response	22	95.7	95.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Good	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	No Response	9	90.0	90.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Fair	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	No Response	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Compressed Video Clsasrooms - performance of equipment (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Good	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
Fair	3	4.8	4.8	6.5
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	8.1
No Response	57	91.9	91.9	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Compressed Video Classrooms - technical Support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No Response	22	100.0	100.0	100.0
Full Time Faculty	Fair	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
	No Response	22	95.7	95.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	No Response	9	90.0	90.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Fair	1	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	No Response	4	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Compressed Video Classrooms - technical Support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	1	1.6	1.6	1.6
Fair	3	4.8	4.8	6.5
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	8.1
No Response	57	91.9	91.9	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Blackboard Services - performance of equpiment

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	No Response	21	95.5	95.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	2	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Good	5	21.7	21.7	30.4
	Fair	1	4.3	4.3	34.8
	No Response	15	65.2	65.2	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Excellent	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Good	1	10.0	10.0	20.0
	No Response	8	80.0	80.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	No Response	6	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Blackboard Services - performance of equpiment (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	4	6.5	6.5	6.5
Good	6	9.7	9.7	16.1
Fair	1	1.6	1.6	17.7
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	19.4
No Response	50	80.6	80.6	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Blackboard Services - technical support

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	No Response	21	95.5	95.5	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	5	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Good	2	8.7	8.7	30.4
	No Response	16	69.6	69.6	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Good	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	No Response	8	80.0	80.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	No Response	6	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Blackboard Services - technical support (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	6	9.7	9.7	9.7
Good	4	6.5	6.5	16.1
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	17.7
No Response	51	82.3	82.3	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Training and Workshops

Used teaching center

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	17	77.3	77.3	77.3
	Yes	2	9.1	9.1	86.4
	No Response	3	13.6	13.6	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	No	11	47.8	47.8	47.8
	Yes	10	43.5	43.5	91.3
	No Response	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	No	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Yes	2	20.0	20.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	No	5	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Yes	1	14.3	14.3	85.7
	No Response	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Used teaching center (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	38	61.3	61.3	61.3
Yes	15	24.2	24.2	85.5
No Response	9	14.5	14.5	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Attending a workshop/training session

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	10	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Yes	9	40.9	40.9	86.4
	No Response	3	13.6	13.6	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	No	4	17.4	18.2	18.2
	Yes	16	69.6	72.7	90.9
	No Response	3	13.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	22	95.7	100.0	
Total		23	100.0		
Part Time Faculty	No	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Yes	2	20.0	20.0	70.0
	No Response	3	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	No	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Yes	4	57.1	57.1	85.7
	No Response	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Attending a workshop/training session (all respondents)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	21	33.9	33.9	34.4
Yes	31	50.0	50.0	85.2
No Response	10	16.1	16.1	100.0
Total	61	98.4	100.0	
Total	62	100.0		

Find the workshop informative

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	No	1	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Yes	8	36.4	36.4	40.9
	Not Applicable	8	36.4	36.4	77.3
	No Response	5	22.7	22.7	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	No	1	4.3	4.3	4.5
	Yes	15	65.2	65.2	72.7
	Not Applicable	3	13.0	13.0	86.4
	No Response	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	22	95.7	100.0	
Total		23	100.0		
Part Time Faculty	Yes	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Not Applicable	3	30.0	30.0	50.0
	No Response	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Yes	4	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Not Applicable	2	28.6	28.6	85.7
	No Response	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Find the workshop informative

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	2	3.2	3.2	3.3
Yes	29	46.8	46.8	50.8
Not Applicable	16	25.8	25.8	77.0
No Response	15	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	62	100.0		

Information Technology Services Overall.

Rate IT services overall

Respondent Type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Classified Staff	Excellent	5	22.7	22.7	22.7
	Good	13	59.1	59.1	81.8
	No Response	4	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	
Full Time Faculty	Excellent	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Good	15	65.2	65.2	82.6
	No Response	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	
Part Time Faculty	Good	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Fair	1	10.0	10.0	60.0
	No Response	4	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	
Administration	Excellent	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Good	2	28.6	28.6	57.1
	Fair	1	14.3	14.3	71.4
	Poor	1	14.3	14.3	85.7
	No Response	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

Rate IT services overall

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Excellent	11	17.7	17.7	17.7
Good	35	56.5	56.5	74.2
Fair	2	3.2	3.2	77.4
Poor	1	1.6	1.6	79.0
No Response	13	21.0	21.0	100.0
Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Findings

Computer Applications

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the computer, software and hardware available for their general computing use. Overall, all groups were very satisfied with the computers they have for their general use (91.5%). Of all the groups, part-time faculty respondents had the lowest satisfaction rating of their computers (87.5%), which is expected given the limited number who have access to personal computers.

When asked about the software available, respondents were also satisfied, with 98.2% of all respondents rating available software either excellent or good. Once again, part-time faculty were much less satisfied (83%) than the other groups, and again, this is expected given their experience with and access to software. All administrators, full-time faculty, and classified staff responding to the survey rated the software available to them as either excellent or good.

Additional hardware, such as printers and scanners, was another topic rated in this section of the survey. Respondents were not as satisfied in this area, with less than 85% rating additional hardware as either excellent or good. Once again, all administrators were satisfied; however, only 81% of full-time faculty and 90% of classified staff were satisfied. Part-time staff continued to be less satisfied, with only 67% rating additional hardware as excellent or good.

The PVCC Internet pages received the lowest ratings of all aspects of computer applications evaluated. About 80% of all respondents rated PVCC Internet pages as excellent or good. The highest ratings came from the part-time faculty, all of who rated

the web pages as excellent or good. Full-time faculty and classified staff responded similarly to this question, with approximately 85% of respondents in each group rating the PVCC Internet pages as excellent or good. Administration gave the lowest ratings in this area, with almost three-fourths (5 of the 7) of them giving fair or poor ratings.

Faculty and Staff often use e-mail as a primary form of communication. Only half of the 10 part-time faculty participating in the survey responded to this question; of those respondents, four rated email services as either excellent or good. Over 85% of respondents in each of the other groups gave excellent or good ratings to the e-mail services (classified staff, 86.4%; full-time faculty, 87.0%; administration, 85.7%).

While students have an email account available through the VCCS, they are not made aware of this fact and are told to use a commercial email system such as Hotmail. Overall, half of respondents (54.8%) did not respond to the question regarding satisfaction with student email services. While caution has to be used in interpreting non-responses, one possible explanation is that respondents were aware of the lack of support for a college-sponsored email system. The majority of responding full-time faculty (64%) rated it as excellent or good. Administrators were relatively split, with 42.9% rating it as excellent or good and 57.1% rating it as fair or poor.

Following this set of questions was an open-ended question asking about additional technology tools that would improve general computing at PVCC. Actual responses are included in Appendix B. Most respondents did not reply, but of those who did, the majority of comments referred to printing services and improving student e-mail services.

The PVCC Intranet is a tool often used to communicate important information to PVCC faculty and staff. For this reason, it was important to gauge the employee usage of

the Intranet. All administrators responding to the survey use the Intranet pages, but only approximately half of responding part-time faculty uses it. The majority of classified staff (95%) uses the Intranet, as does full-time faculty (81%). Following this question was an open-ended question asking the reasons respondents did not use the PVCC Intranet if they didn't. Comments are included as Appendix B, and typically included things such as no need to use it, and that it was difficult to navigate.

Computing Services Service level agreements (SLA's) are available to all faculty and staff members to explain the services available from computing services, and the expectations for the department. Respondents were asked if they were familiar with these SLA's, and if so, to evaluate the usefulness of them in relation to their general computing needs. Administrators were most familiar with the SLA's, with 85.7% responding that they were familiar with them. The majority of part-time faculty and classified staff reported they were not familiar with them (100% and 81.8% respectively), and less than a quarter (24%) of full-time faculty were familiar with the computing services SLA's.

An open-ended question followed this usage question, asking respondents who are familiar with the Computing Service's SLA's to evaluate their usefulness in relation to general computing needs. As the majority of respondents are not familiar with the SLA's, there were few responses to this open-ended question. Exact responses are included in Appendix B. Comments ranged from "excellent" and "very useful" to "too arcane" and "not useful at all."

Technical Support

Another important service of information technology is the technical support provided to faculty and staff. Respondents were first asked to name technical problems

they commonly encounter. A list of these problems is included in Appendix B. Typical problems included computer freezing, updating virus checks and printers jamming.

Respondents were then asked if they use the Help Desk for technical support when they have a technical problem. All responding administrators and full-time faculty reported using the Help desk for technical support. The majority of classified staff (90.9%) also responded that they did use the help desk when they encountered a technical problem. Only about sixty percent of the part-time faculty members (or four) reported using the Help desk (57.1%) however.

Another open-ended question followed this, asking those respondents who do not utilize the Help Desk when they have a technical problem why they do not. Only seven respondents provided comments, and of these, only three responses were relevant to the question. All comments are included in Appendix B. The relevant responses referred to problems such as lack of technical knowledge with visual design materials, not knowing how to contact the help desk, and using technical support staff at another location.

Several aspects of the Help Desk services were of interest in this study. They included availability of technical support, the technical knowledge of the support staff, promptness of response, the ability of the support staff to resolve problems, the delivery of equipment, as well as overall satisfaction with technical support.

Respondents rated the availability of technical support very high overall; 96.5% rated it as either excellent or good. All responding administrators and part-time faculty rated it as excellent or good. It was also rated highly by the remaining groups (classified staff, 95.2%; full-time faculty, 95.5%).

High satisfaction levels were also found for the technical knowledge of the support staff; 92.9% of all respondents rated it as excellent or good. Administrators had

slightly lower ratings for this question, with less than three-fourths (71.4%) of them giving it an excellent or good rating. All full-time faculty respondents and 95% of classified staff rated this question as either excellent or good.

Promptness of support staff response was rated highly overall. All responding part-time faculty and administrators, as well as 95.4% of full-time faculty, and 90.5% of classified staff gave an excellent or good rating.

A space was provided following this set of questions for additional comments related to technical support. About a third of respondents provided an additional comment, all of which are included in Appendix B. Comments were generally very positive, praising the technical support staff, particularly the promptness of reply and the helpfulness of the staff.

Electronic Classrooms/Distance Learning

Respondents were then asked to rate their satisfaction with the electronic classrooms, and aspects related to them. Throughout this section, there was a large percentage of non-respondents. This is indicative of those who have not had any experience with these facilities. For each of the questions, at least half of all respondents did not respond. Given the extremely small sample size for these questions, the primary conclusion that can be drawn is that most PVCC faculty and staff do not use these facilities. The few number of respondents limits additional conclusions about satisfaction levels with each.

The majority of respondents (78.2%) rated the availability of electronic classrooms as either excellent or good. Over 80% of full-time faculty were very satisfied with the availability of these classrooms. Two administrators rated availability as good,

one as poor. One adjunct faculty member rated availability as excellent, one as good, and one as fair.

The respondent group with the most experience in performance of equipment in electronic classrooms, full-time faculty, responded to the question as follows: 18% rated it excellent, 65% rated it good and 17% rated it as fair. This same group gave a higher rating to the technical support for the equipment in the electronic classrooms, with 87% rating it as excellent or good.

Respondents were not as positive when rating the compressed video classroom. Of all the questions, fewest respondents answered these questions. Only one full-time and one part-time faculty member responded, and only three administrators answered. Any conclusions drawn from these results would be based on few experiences. Combined, it can be noted that 80.0% of the five respondents rated both the performance of equipment and technical support as fair or poor.

Slightly more respondents rated PVCC's Blackboard services, however. Both the question regarding the performance of Blackboard equipment and technical support for Blackboard received similar ratings, with approximately 83% of respondents rating performance of Blackboard equipment as excellent or good, and 90.0% rating technical support as excellent or good.

After rating the existing technology tools available for classroom use, respondents were asked if there were any additional tools they felt would improve their classroom teaching experience at PVCC. Exact responses are included in Appendix B, and ranged from better quality projectors, to having Internet access in classrooms.

Training and Workshops

The final set of questions referred to the training and workshops available through instructional technology to faculty and staff. Overall, most of the PVCC faculty and staff had not used the Teaching Center (71.7%). Of all the groups, full-time faculty had the highest percentage of usage (47.6%), and classified staff had the lowest (10.5%).

Overall, about half of the respondents had attended a technology workshop or training session. Again, full-time faculty were most likely to have utilized this service (80% attending) and part-time faculty were least likely to have attended a session (28.6%). Of those who attended a workshop or training session, almost all found it informative. Only two respondents said that the training session was not informative. Open-ended questions followed this section, asking what could have been done to make the workshop/training session more useful and topics that would be useful for future training sessions. Few respondents answered these questions, and their responses are included in Appendix B.

Information Technology Services Overall.

Respondents were asked to rate information and instructional technology services overall, as sort of a conclusion, or summary, of all the aspects covered throughout the survey. Across all groups, over 90% of respondents rated IT services as excellent or good. All responding classified staff and full-time faculty gave excellent or good ratings, as did over 80% of part-time faculty. Administration gave the lowest ratings, with only two-thirds rating the services provided by IT as excellent or good.

Discussion

It is important to remember the response rate for the survey was small and thus we know what some people think, but should not think in terms of conclusions based on widely held opinions of users across the college. Nevertheless, the Task Force has a few recommendations to present for your consideration.

First, the findings showed overall satisfaction with the technical support at the college. In the ever-growing and changing environment of information technology the users find the equipment and support they needed to accomplish their work. On numerous occasions when it met, the Task Force recognized the extraordinary efforts of those who work very hard to support this aspect of our work at PVCC.

We believe it is time to dissolve the Task Force whose goal was to take an outsider's look at technology support at the college. As a part of that recommendation, we suggest broadening the role of the Information Technology Committee. This committee has long served as a means to gather information from users at the college about the Information Technology Plan for the college which governs how funding for technology is spent. The goals of this committee should be broadened to encourage users to give feedback to this group, both individually and as a whole, about their experience with technology at the college.

We believe the recommendations that follow should guide the work of the Information Technology Committee in the coming years.

- Review the SLA's (Service Level Agreements) to determine whether they are usable in their present form.
- Internet/Intranet pages. The rating of the Internet by respondents as a whole was positive, but lukewarm. Using a survey instrument with a broad question asking

respondents to rate the web page as a whole is a very imprecise means to measure usefulness and satisfaction with the Internet pages. A more sophisticated means of evaluating the Internet using established design usability principles could be undertaken (see http://www.stanford.edu/group/web-creators/heuristics.htm for more information on this topic). The usability studies are conducted by asking members of the audience for whom the web page is intended to find the answers to a series of questions by using the web page. The subjects are observed (silently) and their comments and moves throughout the process are recorded by the observer. In the case of the Piedmont Internet pages the audience would include students, prospective students, and employees at Piedmont (except for the web page designers) while a study of the Intranet pages would use employees at Piedmont.

- College support of technology use for part-time faculty. Only 10 of the adjunct faculty employed in the fall 2001 semester responded to the survey; these respondents did not answer all questions on the survey. Recommendation: The college should address the question of whether the current level of use of technology tools (classroom, personal computer, software, email) by the adjunct faculty is sufficient to fulfill their teaching duties. If there are departments, divisions or individual faculty who are not able to do so, the college should identify those cases and provide the needed support. The Information Technology Committee should take up the question of providing the technology support, including email service that enables adjunct faculty to receive email sent to the community.

- Room scheduling should make use of sophisticated technology to avoid the problems of having a "room book."
- The Information Technology Committee should be part of the planning and ordering of electronic classroom hardware in addition to computers. [Administrator] did not agree with this recommendation. She said, "I have reservations about the electronic classroom recommendation. I have not heard a sound explanation as to why it is there. I believe the equipment issues are related to purchasing equipment at different times. This means while we have the same equipment in every room the manufacturer is different and thus the equipment appears different but it really is the same. Involving the IT committee is not going to solve this issue and thus I don't support having the IT committee involved in building the electronic classrooms."
- Compressed Video Classroom. The survey response on this topic tells us this is an underused resource. For both of the questions on this topic (performance of the equipment and technical support) 91.9% of all respondents did not respond. The few who did were less than enthusiastic. Recommendation: the college needs to determine how to maximize the usage of the investment required by the VCCS. One issue to be resolved is whether the equipment functions at an acceptable level for classroom use prior to offering classes.

Appendix A:
Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Appendix A:
Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Question: Do you use the PVCC Intranet? If not, please explain the reasons you don't:

Classified Staff Responses

- I do, but it is not easily laid out for navigation.
- No need.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Have not had a need to yet.
- Too busy to spend time on it, stuff doesn't seem crucial to me
- I have looked at it, consulted it on occasion, but I seldom use it. Most memos publicize most events adequately.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- Very part-time (no real need).
- Rarely on campus while computing

Administrator Responses

- Calendar only.

Question: Are there any technology tools you feel would improve your working experience at PVCC?

Classified Staff Responses

- Faxing from desktop.
- No.
- No.
- I could use a better printer.
- A decent printer.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Be on an Exchange server.
- More zip disks available on more computers
- Zip Drive
- A distribution list for adjunct faculty.
- Better printer.
- E-mail class lists/ e-mail address for students.
- Color printer/ copier.
- Better classroom projectors, printer in my office.
- I need a printer in my office, so I bought one with my own money.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- Better printer in faculty lounge for when computing lab not open.
- E-mail for adjunct faculty & voice-mail for adjunct faculty.

Administrator Responses

- Students should have a PVCC account, not hotmail.
- No.
- Need student e-mail accounts.
- Internet-based scheduling & room-booking system; networked office computers to download software, updates, patches, etc.

Question: Are you familiar with the Computing Services' SLA's (Service Level Agreements)? If so, please evaluate the usefulness of the SLA's in relation to your general computing needs.

Classified Staff Responses

- Excellent service.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Somewhat useful.
- I have not had time to evaluate how our SLA affects the lab I am using.
- Ok.
- Very useful in understanding policies and procedures.

Administrator Responses

- No one reads them or pays any attention to them.
- Excellent.
- SLA's do establish expectation but should be reviewed for completeness and with an eye toward simplification.
- Not particularly helpful.
- Too arcane.

Question: What technical problems do you commonly encounter?

Classified Staff Responses

- Crashes, linking/shared computer problems, printer connection problems.
- Computer freezes up – applications aren't responding.
- Printer problems. Software problems. Usually those two go hand in hand.
- Network outages during web or compass tests.
- Occasional freezes. Rebooting usually resolves the problem.
- Software & hardware problems.
- Illegal operation or computer freezes up.
- Network down during web testing, computers freezing when shutting down.
- Computer locks up frequently.
- Software malfunction or slowness with freezing computer – also hardware problems.
- Hard-drive problems.
- Computer constantly locks up or runs out of disk space.
- Power outages a problem, programs which freeze up.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Computer won't work, software problem, can't pull up Internet.
- Application understanding problems.
- None "commonly"
- Glitches with word processing.
- Various.
- Fairly frequently – 1 every 2 weeks – my computer freezes up & has to be reset/turned off.
- Slow e-mail.
- Problems with my computer.
- Virus, need for new software, computer freezes.
- You name it.

- Sluggish processor on my computer; settings changed on multi-user hardware in teaching rooms.
- Few, mostly minor glitches.
- Crashes.
- Poor articulation/hook-ups from 1 classroom to the next.
- In my office, just minor stuff usually. Help Desk serves me well. In D334, all sorts of breakdowns & glitches- often taken care of quickly. I wish we had a tech person (we sort of do - [name] – in Dickinson part-time.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- Need for AV equipment at Albemarle High.
- Problems with the printer.
- None I can't handle.
- None so far.
- Printer in lounge jams often. My computer skills are weak so I call the help desk often.
- N/a.
- N/a.
- Not used.

Administrator Responses

- Varies.
- Very few – none that happen frequently.
- Computer freezes from time to time.
- Typical window crashes. Rebooting takes care of the problem.
- Printer connection.
- Electronic Classrooms.

Question: Additional comments related to technical support

Classified Staff Responses

- Too much reliance on [name] and problems solved by support staff are always changed by other staff after the fact. All support staff personnel are extremely kind and helpful as they can be.
- The help desk is wonderful and all the workers have been helpful and responsive.
- The help desk has been very responsive, especially given staffing limitations. Priority needs to be given to increasing tech support staff. The number has not changed for years, even though there are many more demands, given the increase in equipment and programs.
- Keep up the good work!
- Very happy that help desk people come to my office in person, rather than talking me through on the phone.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- They are overwhelmed and therefore cannot often get to people as quickly as would be preferred. You often have to be the 'squeaky wheel' to get hardware help when you need it.
- This is an excellent group of people.
- Always prompt and helpful.
- Have not asked for any.
- They are terrific and grossly understaffed.
- [name] and his staff try their hardest and are helpful and patient. They are professionals.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- Very helpful informing me about what sorts of technologies are available for my use.

Administrator Responses

- Sometimes a few support staff delays in answering questions. A call simply to say why they can't get to the problem immediately would be a nice gesture.
- Could use more support staff as the number of computer workstations increase.
- Takes a long time for some projects – like getting info to order new printer or getting an old printer moved.
- Need more training on elec. classrooms, hardware issues, could use more Macintosh support.

Question: What equipment in the classrooms have you used?

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Computer.
- Elmo, projector, computer.
- PowerPoint projector, Elmo.
- All except compressed.
- Elmo, video – haven't learned to use computer yet or CD-rom.
- Elmo, computer, overhead.
- VCR, Elmo, slide projectors, audio.
- Computer.
- Video, PowerPoint, Elmo, student presentations, showing films.
- Elmo, etc. – everything in fact.
- Elmo, PowerPoint, computer, video.
- Elmo.
- Electronic Projector, VCR, Computer, Audio, DVD, Slide Projector.
- Video, Elmo.
- All.
- Projector, video, Elmo, computer.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- I am a student in a TV class, not a prof. The network goes down too often, but our equipment is excellent.
- PC Computers & Printers.

- *Administrator Responses*

- Computer, Internet.
- All.

Question: Are there any additional technology tools you feel would improve your classroom teaching experience at PVCC?

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Web access in more classrooms.
- No extra tools but better integration of tools into infrastructure.
- Upgrade to Dickinson 334.
- Speaker, amplifying system in auditorium.
- Better quality of machinery.
- Better quality projector, especially for text. Stop buying 2nd or 3rd rate stuff. Order what is specified.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- Having a classroom with Internet connectivity.

Question: Did you find the workshop informative? If not, what could have been done differently to make the workshop more useful to you?

Classified Staff Responses

- Longer time allotted; more in-depth.
- Provide more times to attend. It is not made clear if staff is included in some workshops.
- The broad range of previous knowledge makes workshops a problem – often one person's lack of knowledge brings the workshop to a halt.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Most of the time the workshops are informative – but they are often not well organized and could be more informative and easier to understand with a little more "prep" for the workshops. Handouts are always useful.
- More hands on – less abstract.
- Follow-up. I need lots of support – maybe a works study or service learning student could provide more personal support until training sinks in.

Question: Are there particular topics you would like to see addressed in a future workshop?

Classified Staff Response

- Web page design
- Access.
- MS Office Suite, esp. Access.
- Preparation for People Soft.
- Overview of Microsoft Office.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Advanced Excel, intermediate FrontPage.
- Another copyright workshop.
- Perhaps a repeat of scanning, photography and intro to CD 'burning.'
- Specialized use in disciplines. Eg. Teaching math with elec. classrooms and technology.
- Offerings are excellent.

Question: Please provide any additional feedback you have about the information and instructional technology services provided at PVCC.

Classified Staff Responses

- Why is the answer to most of my questions "[name] will handle that"? Also – why isn't IT responsible for ordering hardware? I don't have the knowledge/expertise to know what printer to order, nor do I have any contacts for ordering. That's like telling you to design and place your own retail advertisement in the newspapers.
- Need a way to access our e-mail from home.
- Technology is what you put into it. If you are willing to learn, the tools are there to learn with.
- "Glitches" during compass tests are far too common. We have frequently lost testing data and/or had to get students back into tests several times during a single session. This is a major staff time and morale problem and are unfortunate image problem for the college for new students.
- The Internet homepages needs to be more user-friendly. It is hard for outsiders and employees to find information. Needs better menu – look at other community colleges. There are things on the Intranet that should be on the Internet. Faculty and staff should be able to access e-mail from home using college outlook instead of subscribing to two different e-mails.
- The college-chosen e-mail client should be available from any computer on campus.
- All part-time faculty should have access to e-mail so that 'community' e-mail goes to them.

Full-Time Faculty Responses

- Do students even have rights to an e-mail account at PVCC anymore? I thought they were having to use Hotmail, or other free services. The setup of the new printing capabilities was not well organized this fall. People were asked to setup things on their own computer without proper training and/or the tech support didn't even know many of the answers at the time f/s were told to install the drivers (ex. What each printer was capable of doing).
- Very outdated computer; have asked several-many times for an upgrade.

- I wish [name] would do a help book for MS Word like the one he did for WordPerfect, the help screen is useless.
- Be careful, technology doesn't substitute for teaching! Design of work/instructional spaces is crucial to the highest/best use of that space...current equipment, or future installations should minimize the footprint of the equipment...it is too easy for the instruction to 'hide' behind it...it is worse than the prof. who never ventures beyond the lectern. Some teaching areas don't need technology inserted...smart implementation is better than universal implementation.
- The big problem is understaffing.
- It is important to recognize the varying degrees of interest and expertise among faculty members. Everyone is a place of their own and technology is more essential to some discipline than others. Technology for its own sake is meaningless.
- I've heard lots of criticism of PVCC's website – in comparison to other colleges (VCCS and beyond) ours is apparently boring – needs more photos – showing students enjoying themselves here- and showing various views of college grounds, gardens, buildings, patio, inside and outside.
- As a new faculty member, scheduling of sessions with tech services during the first few weeks of orientation would have saved one a bit of 'hunt and peck' confusion this first semester. It might be a good idea to assess levels of computer expertise for new staff and provide training as needed. Thanks.
- Good- but we don't' seem to be planning adequately for next year. The schedule on-line should be constantly updated as changes are made. We need ongoing e-mail accounts for students.
- Things are improving considerably. I appreciate the efforts by IT.

Part-Time Faculty Responses

- The various announcements sent to staff are often received at AHS a week or two after they have already happened. Earlier delivery needed or they should be sent to instructor's home.
- We could use faster and newer printers in the library. It would be useful if students had access to laptops (library checks them out) and scanners.
- Provide adjunct faculty with e-mail and voice-mail.

Administrator Responses

- The IT staff is definitely overworked. They need more employees to handle the many problems we have. The number of overtime hours they give to PVCC should be rewarded. Computing services does an outstanding job of meeting our needs with so few people to run the operation.
- You do a good job with the current staffing level.
- Need for cross training. When one person is gone some jobs just don't get done. Things seem to get lost- requests for specific information or job requests.

Appendix B:
Survey Instrument

57

Piedmont Virginia Community College
Information Technology Faculty/Staff Survey

The purpose of this survey is to obtain feedback about the information technology facilities and services at PVCC. Please respond to each applicable question, and provide any additional comments that you feel would be helpful in improving services. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete, and your feedback will allow us to evaluate the IT facilities and services, and to identify aspects that need improvement. **If you rate any item "Fair" or "Poor," please comment on that item in Section V, Additional Comments.** Please return the surveys by November 21st to the box provided by the faculty/staff mailboxes.

Section I: Computer Applications

Please rate each the following items based on your experience and overall satisfaction. Circle the appropriate rating.

Computer for your general use	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Software for your general computing use	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Additional hardware (printers, scanners, etc) for your general use	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
PVCC's Internet pages	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Do you use the PVCC Intranet?	Yes	No		

If not, please explain the reasons you don't: _____

_____

Email Services for Faculty/Staff	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Email Services for Students	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

Are there any technology tools you feel would improve your working experience at PVCC? _____

_____

Are you familiar with the Computing Services' SLA's (Service Level Agreements)? Yes No

If so, please evaluate the usefulness of the SLA's in relation to your general computing needs: _____

_____

Section II: Technical Support (Help Desk and/or other sources)

What technical problems do you commonly encounter? _____

_____

Do you use the Help Desk for technical support when you have a technical problem? Yes No

If not, please explain the reasons you don't: _____

_____

Please rate each the following items based on your experience and overall satisfaction. Circle the appropriate rating.

Availability of technical support	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Technical knowledge of support staff	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Promptness of response	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Ability of support staff to resolve problems	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Delivery of equipment to classrooms	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall satisfaction with technical support	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

dditional comments related to technical support: _____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section III: Electronic Classrooms/ Distance Learning

If you have not had experience with the electronic classrooms or distance learning, please skip to Section IV.
Please rate each the following items based on your experience. Circle the appropriate rating.

Availability of electronic classrooms Excellent Good Fair Poor No Experience

What equipment in the classrooms have you used? _____

_____

Please rate your overall satisfaction for each of the following areas:

Electronic Classrooms

Performance of equipment	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience
Technical support for equipment	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience

Compressed Video Classroom

Performance of equipment	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience
Technical support for equipment	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience

PVCC Blackboard Services

Performance of software	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience
Technical support for software	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Experience

Are there any additional technology tools you feel would improve your classroom teaching experience at PVCC?

_____

Section IV: Training & Workshops

Have you used the Teaching Center?	Yes	No	
Have you attended a technology workshop/training session?	Yes	No	
Did you find the workshop informative?	Yes	No	Not Applicable

If no, what could have been done differently to make the workshop more useful to you? _____

_____

Are there particular topics you would like to see addressed in a future workshop? _____

_____

Section V: Additional Comments/Suggestions

Please rate information and instructional technology services overall:

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Please provide any additional feedback you have about the information and instructional technology services provided at PVCC: __

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").